UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/582,122	82,122 02/20/2007 Thomas Brinz		10191/4358	8791
26646 KENYON & K	7590 10/15/201 ENYON LLP	EXAMINER		
ONE BROADV NEW YORK, N		BENITEZ, JOSHUA		
NEW TORK, I	N1 10004		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2858	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			10/15/2010	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
10/582,122	BRINZ ET AL.	
Examiner	Art Unit	
JOSHUA BENITEZ	2858	

JOSHUA BENI	TEZ	2858	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover	er sheet with the d	correspondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED 30 September 2010 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION	N IN CONDITION F	OR ALLOWANCE.	
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an ar application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reperiods:	mendment, affidavi ee) in compliance	t, or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or	hich places the (3) a Request
 a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection. b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or one event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MON Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f). 	(2) the date set forth ITHS from the mailing	g date of the final rejection	n.
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petitic have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the counder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL	rresponding amount of period for reply origi	of the fee. The appropria nally set in the final Offic	ate extension fee e action; or (2) as
 The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in compliance with 37 Cl filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time per AMENIMENTS. 	CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the	
AMENDMENTS 3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the data (a) They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/o (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below); (c) They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appearappeal; and/or	or search (see NO)	TE below);	
(d) They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding nu NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).			
 The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): 	Notice of Non-Co	mpliant Amendment (I	PTOL-324).
 Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowable if submit non-allowable claim(s). 	ted in a separate, t	imely filed amendmer	t canceling the
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) will not be en how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or ap The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: 30-32,34-36 and 38-57. Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: 58. Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:		l be entered and an ex	planation of
<u>AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE</u> 8. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the	e date of filing a No	otice of Anneal will not	he entered
because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reaso was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).			
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appe entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome <u>all</u> rejections showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not ea	ctions under appea rlier presented. Se	al and/or appellant fails ee 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1)	s to provide a
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER		•	
 The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT plac <u>See Continuation Sheet.</u> 	• •	condition for allowand	ce because:
 12. ☐ Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i>(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper 13. ☐ Other: See Continuation Sheet. 	per No(s)		
/Ha T. Nguyen/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2858			

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Regarding claim 58, Applicant cites MPEP 2106.01 makes it clear that "when functional descriptive material is recorded on some computer readable medium, it becomes trscuturally and functionally interrelated to the medium and it will be statutory" and also argues that the claim should be treated as a product claim. The Examiner respectfully disagrees. The Examiner did not question in the Final Rejection whether claim 58 is statutory. Claim 58 was rejected under 112.2 for being indefinite, so establishing that the claim is statutory is irrelevant to the rejection in question. Applicant argues that the claim should be treated as a structure. However, the claim only recites method steps that in no way are interrelated to the structure, or positively affect any structure, creating the 112.2 issue as explained in the Final Office Action. Applicant is kindly reminded that merely citing method steps does not correlate to a structure unless it is clear and positively cited in the limitations how such method steps affect the structure. This is not the case in the claim in question.

Continuation of 13. Other: /Ha Nguyen/